



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH PA
P O BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

COPY MAILED

NOV 29 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Sang K. Cha et al	:	
Application No. 10/087,360	:	DECISION GRANTING PETITION
Filed: March 1, 2002	:	UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)
Attorney Docket No. 2058.133US1	:	

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed September 6, 2006, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action mailed October 20, 2005, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on January 21, 2006.

The petition satisfies the conditions for revival pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that (1) the reply (amendment), (2) the \$1,500 petition fee, and (3) the required statement of unintentional delay have been received. Accordingly, the reply to the non-final Office action of October 20, 2005 is accepted as having been unintentionally delayed.

The rule at 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that "the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional." Since the statement appearing in the petition varies from the language of the rule, the statement is being construed as the statement required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3). Petitioner must notify the Office if this is not a correct interpretation of the statement appearing in the petition.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue. Nevertheless, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that the delay was intentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136, an extension of time must be filed prior to the expiration of the maximum period obtainable for reply to avoid abandonment. Accordingly, since the \$1,020 extension of time fee submitted with the petition on September 6, 2006 was subsequent to the maximum period obtainable for reply, this fee is unnecessary and will be credited to petitioner's deposit account in due course.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3218.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center AU 2163 for appropriate action in the normal course of business on the reply received September 6, 2006.


Frances Hicks
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions